

REMARKS

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of the present application.

In the Office Action, claims 43-51, 63, and 64 were allowed. Also, claim 58 was rejected only under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, but the subject matter of claim 58 was indicated as being otherwise allowable. New dependent claims 66-72 have been added, which all depend from independent claim 58. These new dependent claims have support in the original application. In fact, new claims 66-72 are supported by the allowed claims. For example, new claims 66-72 are supported by allowed claims 44-49. No new matter has been added by the present amendment.

Finally, Applicants believe that claim 58 is sufficiently clear within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph. In rejecting claim 58, the Office Action states that “if the opaque crosslinked polymer layer overlies the peelable film, then the peelable film cannot be placed on the exposed side of the opaque crosslinked polymer layer as the peelable layer requirement is under the opaque layer.” From this statement, it appears that the Examiner has misinterpreted the second to last limitation of claim 58, which requires “placing the peelable film layer on the surface with the opaque crosslinked polymer layer exposed.” Emphasis added.

Claim 58 requires that the transferable portion comprise a peelable film layer overlying the release coating layer (of the non-transferable portion) and an opaque crosslinked polymer layer overlying the peelable film layer. Thus, when the non-transferable portion is removed from the transferable portion (as required by claim 58), the transferable portion has the opaque crosslinked polymer layer overlying the

peelable film layer. Then, according to claim 58, the transferable portion (the peelable film layer and the opaque crosslinked polymer layer) are placed on the surface such that the opaque crosslinked polymer layer is exposed. Applicants respectfully submit claim 58 is sufficiently clear and particularly points out the subject matter claimed. Thus, Applicants believe that claim 58 is allowable under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph.

Should any further questions or concerns arise after consideration of this Response, Examiner Dicus is invited and encouraged to contact the undersigned.

Please charge any additional fees required by this Response to Deposit Account No. 04-1403.

Respectfully requested,
DORITY & MANNING, P.A.



Alan R. Marshall
Registration No. 56,405

P. O. Box 1449
Greenville, SC 29602-1449
Phone: (864) 271-1592
Facsimile: (864) 233-7342

Date: January 30, 2007